arXiv:1208.1742v1 [hep-ph] 8 Aug 2012

Spectrum of low-lying $s^3Q\bar{Q}$ configurations with negative parity

S. G. Yuan[1,2,3,4], C. S. An[2,3],* K. W. Wei[2,3,5], B. S. Zou[2,3,6],† and H. S. Xu[1,3]

1. Institute of Modern Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Lanzhou 730000, China

2.Institute of High Energy Physics,

Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China

3. Theoretical Physics Center for Science Facilities,

Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China

4. Shanghai Institute of Applied Physics,

Chinese Academy of Sciences, Shanghai 201800, China

5. College of Physics and Electrical Engineering,

Anyang Normal University, Henan 455002, China

6. State Key Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Institute of Theoretical Physics,

Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China

(Dated: August 9, 2012)

Abstract

Spectrum of low-lying five-quark configurations with strangeness quantum number $S = -3$ and negative parity is studied in three kinds of constituent quark models, namely the one gluon exchange, Goldstone Boson exchange, and instanton-induced hyperfine interaction models, respectively. Our numerical results show that the lowest energy states in all the three employed models are lying at ∼1800 MeV, about 200 MeV lower than predictions of various quenched three-quark models. In addition, it is very interesting that the state with the lowest energy in one gluon exchange model is with spin 3/2, but 1/2 in the other two models.

PACS numbers: 12.39.-x, 14.20.Jn, 14.20.Pt

*Electronic address: ancs@ihep.ac.cn

†Electronic address: zoubs@ihep.ac.cn

I. INTRODUCTION

Up to now, the experimental information on the Ω hyperon excitations is still very poor [1]. There are only four Ω states discovered [2–5], namely the ground state $\Omega(1672)$, and three excitations $\Omega(2250)$, $\Omega(2380)$ and $\Omega(2470)$. Among these four states, only $\Omega(1672)$ has been clarified to have spin parity quantum number $\frac{3}{2}^-$, while quantum numbers for the other three have not been pinned down yet.

Although there has not been any further experimental evidence about Ω^* since 1990s, theorists are always interested in spectrum of Ω excitations, which has been investigated within various approaches, such as constituent quark models based on one gloun exchange [6, 7], Goldstone Boson exchange [8, 9] and instanton-induced [10] interactions, respectively, large $1/N_c$ expansion of QCD [11–15], bound state approach of Skyrme model [16], meson-baryon chiral dynamics [17], etc. Most of the theorists have tried to compare their predictions with data, while information from experiments is so poor that definite comparison seems to be impossible. However, to give more guidance for future experimental measurements, systematical studies of Ω^* spectrum in different theoretical approaches are valuable.

Recently, the traditional constituent quark model is developed to include higher Fock components, it is shown that there should be notable five-quark components in the baryon resonances [18–27]. So it immediately occurs to us that the five-quark components in Ω^* should be very important, because all the three valence quarks in Ω^* are strange ones, then the five-quark configurations with $q\bar{q}$ pairs (we denote $Q\bar{Q} \equiv q\bar{q}$ and $Q\bar{Q} \equiv s\bar{s}$ for light and strange quark-antiquark pairs, respectively.) must play very special roles in the properties of Ω^*. Since the $q\bar{q}$ pair has different flavor with valence strange quarks, it has two advantages for the study of five-quark components. First, there is not any Pauli blocking effect for the q, which would result in lower excitation energy for the new excitation mechanism of Ω states by pulling out a $q\bar{q}$ pair and make the five-quark components larger in Ω^* than in N^*, Λ^*, etc. Secondly it simplifies the model calculation of the five quark system.

To specify the roles of $s^3Q\bar{Q}$ in Ω^*, as the first step, we investigate the spectrum of low lying $s^3Q\bar{Q}$ configurations with negative parity in this manuscript, employing the constituent quark model complemented by three different kinds of hyperfine interactions between quarks, i.e. the one gluon exchange (OGE), Goldstone Boson exchange (GBE) and instanton-induced (INS) force interactions, respectively. In order to get more accurate information about the

five-quark configurations with light $q\bar{q}$ pairs, the $SU(3)\otimes SU(2)\otimes O(3)$ breaking corrections are taken into account in our model.

The present manuscript is organized as follows. In Section II, we present our theoretical framework, which includes explicit forms of the employed hyperfine interactions between quarks. Numerical results for spectrum of the studied five-quark configurations in our model are shown in Section III. Finally, Section IV contains a brief conclusion.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In the constituent quark model, Hamiltonian for a five-quark system with a $Q\bar{Q}$ pair can be expressed as:

$$H \;=\; H_o + H_{hyp} + \sum_{i=1}^{5} m_i \,, \tag{1}$$

where m_i denote the constituent masses of the quarks, H_{hyp} is the hyperfine interaction between quarks, which is often treated as perturbation, and H_o the Hamiltonian concerning orbital motions of the quarks which should contain two parts, namely the kinetic term and confining potential of the quarks. Both of the orbital Hamiltonian H_o and the hyperfine interaction H_{hyp} for three-quark system have been intensively discussed in literatures, here we will develop them to five-quark system explicitly in Sec. II A and II B.

A. The orbital Hamiltonian for a five-quark system

In this manuscript, the employed form of H_o is as follow

$$H_o = \sum_{i=1}^{5} \frac{\vec{p}_i^{\,2}}{2m_i} - \frac{\vec{P}_{cm}^{\,2}}{2M} + \sum_{i<j}^{5} V_{conf}(r_{ij}) \,, \tag{2}$$

where $\vec{P}_{cm}$ and M denote the total momentum and mass of the five-quark system. The confining potential $V_{conf}(r_{ij})$ is taken to be the commonly accepted color confinement [7, 8]

$$V_{conf}(r_{ij}) = -\frac{3}{8}\lambda_i^C \cdot \lambda_j^C \left[C(\vec{r}_i - \vec{r}_j)^2 + V_0\right] . \tag{3}$$

Here $\lambda_{i(j)}^C$ are the Gell-Mann matrices in the $SU(3)$ color space, C denotes a confinement strength constant, and V_0 represents the unharmonic part of V_{conf} which is treated as a constant in this manuscript. Explicit calculations show that the matrix elements of $\lambda_i^C \cdot \lambda_j^C$

between both of QQ and $Q\bar{Q}$ pairs in a five-quark system are the same value $-4/3$, which is half of the matrix element between a QQ pair in a three-quark system. Therefore, in the case of the $Q\bar{Q}$ in a five-quark system being $s\bar{s}$ pair, H_o reduces to the following form

$$H_o = \sum_{i=1}^{4}\left(\vec{\tilde{p}}_i^{\,2}/2m_s + \frac{5C}{2}\vec{\xi}_i^{\,2}\right) + 5V_0\,, \tag{4}$$

where ξ_i represent the Jacobi coordinates for a system of 5 constituents which are defined as follow

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{\xi}_i &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{i+i^2}}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{i}\vec{r}_j - i\vec{r}_i\right),\ i=1,\cdots,4\,,\\ \vec{R}_{cm} &= \frac{1}{5}\sum_{i=1}^{5}\vec{r}_i\,,\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

and $\vec{\tilde{p}}_i$ the corresponding momentums. Then the eigenvalue of H_o should be

$$E_o = (N+6)\omega + 5V_0\,, \tag{6}$$

where ω denotes the oscillator frequency which is defined as $\omega = \sqrt{5C/m_s}$, and $N = 2N^r + L$ is the number of excited quanta of the oscillators. In this manuscript, we consider the $s^3Q\bar{Q}$ configurations with $N^r = L = 0$, namely all the quarks and antiquarks in the five-quark configurations are in their ground states, then the energy (6) reduces to $E_o = 6\omega + 5V_0$. ω can be determined in the following way, as we know, the oscillator frequency ω_3 for a three light quarks system is $\omega_3 = \sqrt{6C/m}$ with m the constituent mass of the light quark, then we can obtain that $\omega = \sqrt{\frac{5m}{6m_s}}\omega_3$. And ω_3 can be inferred from the empirical radius of the proton which leads to $\sqrt{m\omega_3} \simeq 246$ MeV, or mass splitting between nucleon and $N(1440)$ which yields $\omega_3 = 251$ MeV. We take the latter value in this manuscript.

Eigenfunction of H_o in the case of $N = 0$ is just a completely symmetric wave function regarding the four Jaccobi coordinates, then we can construct the complete wave functions of $s^3Q\bar{Q}$ configurations in the following way: first, color wave functions of the four-quark subsystems in any $QQQQ\bar{Q}$ systems must be $[211]_C$, to combine with the anti-quark to form a color singlet, consequently, the flavor-spin symmetry of the four-quark subsystems in the $s^3Q\bar{Q}$ configurations can only be $[31]_{FS}$. Moreover, the flavor wave functions of a $sssq$ system can be completely symmetric $[4]_F$ or mixed symmetric $[31]_F$. As shown in [9], four kinds of four-quark wave functions can meet the above requirements. Coupling these four-quark systems to the antiquark, one can obtain two five-quark configurations with $s\bar{s}$,

and seven configurations with $q\bar{q}$. The total spin for these configurations can be 1/2, 3/2 and 5/2, as shown in Table I. Explicit wave functions for these configurations can be easily derived from the ones given in [28].

Finally, in the case of $Q\bar{Q}$ being a light quark-antiquark pair, we have to take into account the $SU(3)$ breaking corrections. As shown in [29], we can use the Hamiltonian (4) as an approximation which can be complemented by a flavor dependent perturbative term $H_o^{'}$

$$H_o^{\prime} = \frac{m_s - m}{m_s} \sum_{i=1}^{4} \left(\frac{\vec{p}_i^2 + \vec{p}_5^2}{2m} - \frac{\vec{P}_{cm}^2}{5(3m_s + 2m)} \right) \delta_{iq} \,, \tag{7}$$

here m is the constituent mass of the light quark, δ_{iq} is a flavor dependent operator with eigenvalue 1 for light quark and 0 for strange quark. In the present case, all of the quarks and antiquark are in their ground states, one can get that the matrix elements of $H_o^{'}$ between all of the studied configurations are the same one

$$\langle H_o^{\prime} \rangle = \frac{6}{5} (\frac{m_s}{m} - 1) \omega \,, \tag{8}$$

B. The hyperfine interaction between quarks

As stated in Sec II A, there are nine different configurations studied in this manuscript. If the approximation that $H_{hyp} = 0$ is applied, the five-quark configurations with $q\bar{q}$ and $s\bar{s}$ should be two categories of degenerate states. To calculate the mass splittings of the degenerate configurations, explicit perturbative hyperfine interactions are needed. Here we employ three different kinds of spin-spin forces, which are mediated by one gluon exchange [30–33], Goldstone Boson exchange [8, 9] and instanton-induced interactions [10, 34–37], respectively, as hyperfine interactions between quarks. These interactions between both of QQ and $Q\bar{Q}$ pairs have been explicitly given in literatures, here we just present a very brief review, and apply them to a five-quark system.

In the OGE model, hyperfine interaction between quarks can be expressed as chromomagnetic form, which has been intensively used in the studies of multiquark configurations [38–41]. Here we employ the form given in [40, 41]

$$H_{hyp}^{OGE} = -\sum_{i,j} C_{i,j} \vec{\lambda}_i^C \cdot \vec{\lambda}_j^C \vec{\sigma}_i \cdot \vec{\sigma}_j, \tag{9}$$

where $\vec{\sigma}_i$ are the Pauli spin matrices, $\vec{\lambda}_i^c$ the Gell-Mann $SU(3)_C$ color matrices, and $C_{i,j}$ a flavor dependent chromomagnetic interaction strength operator. If the subscript i or j

indicates an antiquark, the following replacement should be applied: $\vec{\lambda}^C \to -\vec{\lambda}^{C*}$. Once the overall symmetry is taken into account, the hyperfine interaction (9) should reduce to

$$H_{hyp}^{OGE} = -6C_{1,2}\vec{\lambda}_1^C \cdot \vec{\lambda}_2^C \vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{\sigma}_2 + 4C_{4,5}\vec{\lambda}_4^C \cdot \vec{\lambda}_5^{C*} \vec{\sigma}_4 \cdot \vec{\sigma}_5 \tag{10}$$

The resulting matrix elements of the color, spin and flavor dependent chromomagnetic strength operators are given explicitly in Appendix A. And values of interaction strength constants C_{QQ} and $C_{\bar{Q}Q}$ can be found in [40–42].

In Ref. [9], the GBE model is applied to calculate spectrum of the five-quark configurations with quantum numbers of N, Λ, Σ, Ξ and Ω resonances. While in that paper, the hyperfine interaction is of a $SU(3)$ symmetric form, namely, the coupling strength of π, K and η meson exchanges are taken to be a same one. In present case, we take the $SU(3)$ broken form of H_{hyp}^{GBE} which is given in [8]

$$H_{hyp}^{GBE} = -\sum_{i,j}^{4} C_{i,j}^{M} \vec{\lambda}_i^F \cdot \vec{\lambda}_j^F \vec{\sigma}_i \cdot \vec{\sigma}_j, \tag{11}$$

where λ_i^F are the Gell-Mann matrices in flavor space, and $C_{i,j}^M$ a flavor dependent operator for strength of a meson M exchange between the ith and jth quarks. Notice that in the GBE model [8], hyperfine interaction between quark and antiquark is assumed to be automatically included in the GBE interaction, so the spin-spin interaction H_{hyp}^{GBE} in Eq. (11) is restricted to the four-quark subsystem. After taking into account the overall symmetry, H_{hyp}^{GBE} reduces to the following form

$$H_{hyp}^{GBE} = -6C_{1,2}^{M} \vec{\lambda}_1^F \cdot \vec{\lambda}_2^F \vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{\sigma}_2 \,, \tag{12}$$

the matrix elements of the spin operator $\vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{\sigma}_2$ are the same as those in the OGE model which are given in Appendix A, and we list the matrix elements of the flavor dependent operator $C_{1,2}^M \vec{\lambda}_1^F \cdot \vec{\lambda}_2^F$ in Appendix B. Notice that we have to treat properly the three subsets of the η meson exchange between two quarks, namely, the exchange interaction for pairs of light quarks($C^{u\bar{u}}$ and $C^{d\bar{d}}$), and two strange quarks ($C^{s\bar{s}}$). It's proposed by Glozman and Riska in [8] that the strengths of the meson exchange interactions may have the following relations

$$C^{u\bar{u}} = C^{d\bar{d}} = C^{\pi};\ C^{K} = \frac{m}{m_s} C^{\pi};\ C^{s\bar{s}} = (\frac{m}{m_s})^2 C^{\pi} \,, \tag{13}$$

and the phenomenological value for C^{π} is around 20$\sim$30 MeV [8, 9].

Finally, the instanton-induced hyperfine interaction between quarks is of the form [35–37]

$$\begin{aligned} H_{hyp}^{INS} &= -12\left(gP_{1,2}^{qq}+g'P_{1,2}^{qs}\right)\left(P_{1,2}^{S=1}P_{1,2}^{C,6}+2P_{1,2}^{S=0}P_{1,2}^{C,\bar{3}}\right) \\ &\quad +4\hat{g}_{4,5}\left[\frac{3}{2}P_{4,5}^{S=1}P_{4,5}^{C,8}+P_{4,5}^{S=0}\left(\frac{1}{2}P_{4,5}^{C,8}+8P_{4,5}^{C,1}\right)\right], \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where the first term is the operator for interaction between two quarks, and the second for quark-antiquark interaction, $P^{QQ'}$ are the projectors on flavor antisymmetrical QQ' states, $P^{S=x}$ the projectors on spin x states, and $P^{C,y}$ the projectors on color representation of dimension y, respectively. g and g' are the strength constants of interactions between two light quarks, and one light quark and one strange quark, respectively. Finally, $\hat{g}_{4,5}$ is a flavor projector operator, its eigenvalue is -g for $q\bar{q}$ and -$g^{'}$ for $s\bar{q}$. Notice that $\hat{g}$ also couples isospin 0 $Q\bar{Q}$ states. Matrix elements of spin and color operators are given in Appendix C. The values of g and g' can be found in Ref [42], notice that a factor 6 is included in g and g' in [42].

III. NUMERICAL RESULTS

As stated in Sec II, parameters in the present manuscript are the constituent masses of the light and strange quarks m and m_s, the unharmonic part of the confinement potential V_0, the oscillator parameter ω, and the strength constants in the employed three kinds of hyperfine interactions. We just take the parameters for hyperfine interactions to be the ones given in the literatures listed in Sec II, and the constituent masses of quarks and V_0 to be the empirical ones given in [42], and the oscillator parameter ω is then ~ 196 MeV. All the values for parameters are listed in Table II.

The procedure to obtain numerical results in our model can be via three steps: at first, one has to calculate the eigenvalues of the orbital Hamiltonian H_o, which can be obtained by Eqs. (6) and (8); secondly, one should calculate the matrix elements of the perturbative hyperfine interactions, as we can see in Table I, matrices for the spin 1/2, 3/2 and 5/2 configurations are with 4, 4 and 1 dimensions, respectively; finally, energies of the studied states should be produced by diagonalization of the obtained matrices in the second step.

In a given model, all of the studied five-quark configurations should have a same energy if we don't consider the hyperfine interactions between quarks and difference between constituent masses of light and strange quarks. Since the unharmonic parameter V_0 is taken

to be different in the three hyperfine interaction model [42], the obtained numerical values $E_0 \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{5} m_i + E_o$ for the five-quark configurations with $q\bar{q}$ in the OGE, GBE and INS models are 2196, 1891 and 2171 MeV, respectively, and those for the configurations with $s\bar{s}$ are 2436, 2131 and 2411 MeV in the three models, respectively.

In the calculations of elements of the hyperfine interactions matrices, we label the configurations listed in Table I as follow

$$\begin{aligned}
&1 \,:\, s^3q([4]_X[211]_C[31]_{FS}[31]_F[22]_S)\otimes\bar{q}\,,\\
&2 \,:\, s^3q([4]_X[211]_C[31]_{FS}[31]_F[31]_S)\otimes\bar{q}\,,\\
&3 \,:\, s^3q([4]_X[211]_C[31]_{FS}[4]_F[31]_S)\otimes\bar{q}\,,\\
&4 \,:\, s^4([4]_X[211]_C[31]_{FS}[4]_F[31]_S)\otimes\bar{s}\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

for the configurations with total spin 1/2, and

$$\begin{aligned}
&1 \,:\, s^3q([4]_X[211]_C[31]_{FS}[31]_F[31]_S)\otimes\bar{q}\,,\\
&2 \,:\, s^3q([4]_X[211]_C[31]_{FS}[31]_F[4]_S)\otimes\bar{q}\,,\\
&3 \,:\, s^3q([4]_X[211]_C[31]_{FS}[4]_F[31]_S)\otimes\bar{q}\,,\\
&4 \,:\, s^4([4]_X[211]_C[31]_{FS}[4]_F[31]_S)\otimes\bar{s}\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

for the configurations with total spin 3/2. We give the numerical results for the energies of these configurations in the next two subsections.

A. Numerical results without corrections of configuration mixing

Explicit calculations of the matrix elements of hyperfine interactions between quarks in the three models lead to the following matrices for the spin 1/2 and 3/2 five-quark configurations

$$\mathcal{E}^{OGE}_{1/2} = \begin{pmatrix} 2235.0 & -139.6 & 10.8 & 0.0 \\ -149.6 & 2365.4 & -25.6 & 0.0 \\ 10.8 & -25.6 & 2373.7 & 0.0 \\ 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 2654.7 \end{pmatrix}, \mathcal{E}^{OGE}_{3/2} = \begin{pmatrix} 2223.4 & 328.9 & 6.6 & 0.0 \\ 328.9 & 2095.0 & -68.0 & 0.0 \\ 6.6 & -68.0 & 2333.7 & 0.0 \\ 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 2517.1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{1/2}^{GBE}=\begin{pmatrix}1833.6 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0\\ 0.0 & 1896.6 & -16.2 & 0.0\\ 0.0 & -16.2 & 2010.0 & 0.0\\ 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 2161.6\end{pmatrix},\mathcal{E}_{3/2}^{GBE}=\begin{pmatrix}1896.6 & 0.0 & -16.2 & 0.0\\ 0.0 & 1990.2 & 0.0 & 0.0\\ -16.2 & 0.0 & 2010.0 & 0.0\\ 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 2161.6\end{pmatrix},$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{1/2}^{INS}=\begin{pmatrix}1928.0 & -121.5 & -30.4 & -33.3\\ -121.5 & 1908.8 & 30.4 & 33.3\\ -30.4 & 30.4 & 2230.3 & 47.1\\ -33.3 & 33.3 & 47.1 & 2411.0\end{pmatrix},\mathcal{E}_{3/2}^{INS}=\begin{pmatrix}2052.0 & -113.3 & -60.7 & -66.7\\ -113.3 & 2250.0 & 191.9 & 210.8\\ -60.7 & 191.9 & 2159.0 & 188.5\\ -66.7 & 210.8 & 188.5 & 2411.0\end{pmatrix}. \quad (17)$$

The results are in unit of MeV. Notice that values of E_0 are already included in the diagonal terms of the matrices. For the only configuration with spin 5/2, the numerical results in OGE, GBE and INS models are 2492, 1990 and 1987 MeV, respectively.

As we can see in Eq. (17), in the OGE model, it's very interesting that the diagonal matrix element with lowest energy in $\mathcal{E}_{1/2}^{OGE}$ is about 140 MeV higher than that in $\mathcal{E}_{3/2}^{OGE}$. As we know, the diagonal matrix elements $\mathcal{E}_S^{hyp}(i,i)$ in the above matrices just represent the energies of the ith five-quark configuration as labeled by Eqs. (15) and (16), so we can conclude that the lowest energy state in OGE model is with spin 3/2, if mixing of the configurations with same spin are not taken into account. It's because of that the contributions from $Q\bar{Q}$ hyperfine interactions to spin 1/2 states are larger than those to 3/2 states. This is the most important difference between the OGE and the other two models. In addition, as we can see in (17), some of the non-diagonal terms $M_S^{hyp}(i,j)$ are very large, which should lead to strong mixing between different configurations. While note that the configuration with $s\bar{s}$ pair doesn't mix with the other three configurations in OGE model.

In the GBE model, there are only two nonzero non-diagonal matrix elements in both of $\mathcal{E}_{1/2}^{GBE}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{3/2}^{GBE}$. These nonzero elements are caused by the non-vanishing matrix elements of the flavor dependent operator $C_{1,2}$ between flavor wave functions $[31]_F$ and $[4]_F$. But the nonzero $\mathcal{E}_S^{GBE}(i,j)$ are much smaller than the diagonal matrix elements $\mathcal{E}_S^{GBE}(i,i)$, so the mixing of the configurations with same spin should be very weak in GBE model. One may notice that an obvious difference between OGE and GBE models is that $Q\bar{Q}$ interactions are assumed to be included in meson-exchange between quarks in GBE model, but in OGE model, $Q\bar{Q}$ interactions which lead to large non-diagonal matrix elements are independent with hyperfine interactions between quark pairs.

In the INS model, the most significant feature is that the five-quark configurations with

$s\bar{s}$ can mix with those with light $q\bar{q}$, as we can see in Eq. (17), all the non-diagonal matrix elements $\mathcal{E}_S^{INS}(i,4)$ with $i = 1,2,3$ are not 0, this is caused by the nonzero matrix elements $\langle q\bar{q}|\hat{g}_{i,5}|s\bar{s}\rangle$. Moreover, the matrix element $\langle u\bar{u}|\hat{g}_{i,5}|d\bar{d}\rangle$ is also not 0. In the present manuscript, the studied five-quark configurations are with quantum numbers of Ω^*, whose isospin should be 0, consequently, in the case of $Q\bar{Q} = q\bar{q}$, wave function should be the isocalar one $1/\sqrt{2}(|sssu\bar{u}\rangle + |sssd\bar{d}\rangle)$. Therefore, the $Q\bar{Q}$ interaction between $\bar{u}$ and $\bar{d}$ components should also contribute to the total energy.

B. Numerical results with configurations mixings

Diagonalization of matrices (17) leads to the energies for the studied five-quark configurations as shown in Table III compared to what obtained by Helminen and Riska [9] using $SU(3)$ symmetric version of GBE model, and the wave functions for spin 1/2 and 3/2 states correspond to the energies in Table III are of course linear combinations of the configurations listed in Table I, and corresponding coefficients for the combinations are given in Table IV and V.

As we can see in Table III, in OGE model, most of the obtained energies after diagonalization of hyperfine interaction matrices are lower than the diagonal matrix elements in Eq. (17), it means that mixing of the configurations decreases the energies in OGE model. While in any case, spin of the state with lowest energy is still 3/2, which is about 328 MeV lower than the lowest spin 1/2 state. Just as we can see in Eq. (17), absolute values of the non-diagonal matrix elements $\mathcal{E}_{3/2}^{OGE}(1,2)$ and $\mathcal{E}_{3/2}^{OGE}(2,1)$ are more than 2 times of those of $\mathcal{E}_{1/2}^{OGE}(1,2)$ and $\mathcal{E}_{1/2}^{OGE}(2,1)$, and it's the same case for $\mathcal{E}_S^{OGE}(2,3)$ and $\mathcal{E}_S^{OGE}(3,2)$, so mixing of the spin 3/2 states is much stronger than that of spin 1/2 states as shown in Table IV and V, and energies of 3/2 states are decreased much more than 1/2 states after diagonalization of matrices (17).

In GBE model, the results don't change very much after diagonalization of Eq. (17). Because most of the non-diagonal matrix elements are 0, and the only two nonzero elements in $\mathcal{E}_{1/2}^{GBE}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{3/2}^{GBE}$ are very small, so mixing of the configurations in GBE model is very weak, for instance, for the spin 1/2 states, the only nonzero mixing angle which is for configurations 2 and 3 is about 0.14. Here we have compared our numerical results to what obtained by GBE model in flavor $SU(3)$ symmetric case [9]. As we can see in Table III, energies of the

states with $q\bar{q}$ in our model are around 100 MeV lower than those obtained by Helminen and Riska, and $s\bar{s}$ are around 220 MeV lower. The reason is that on the one hand the oscillator parameter is taken to be $\omega_{HR} = 228$ MeV for all the five-quark configurations in Helminen and Riska's model, while in the present manuscript, because there are at least 3 strange quarks in the studied configurations, we employ $\omega = \sqrt{m/m_s}\omega_{HR} \simeq 196$ MeV, and take into account a correction (8) caused by lighter constituent mass of the light quark, which should contribute about 83 MeV to energies of all the studied configurations, on the other hand, considering the corrections of $SU(3)$ symmetry breaking, the strength for a K (or $s\bar{s}$) exchange between one light and one strange (or two strange) quarks should be smaller than strength for π exchange between two light quarks, but in Ref. [9], the strengths for π, K and η exchanges are taken to be a same one.

In INS model, mixing of the configurations with same spin parity quantum number is very strong, as shown in Table IV and V. As we can see in Table III, energy of the spin 1/2 state with lowest energy is about 131 MeV lower than the one without configuration mixing corrections given in Eq. (17), that is caused by strong mixing between first and second configurations labeled by Eq. (15) and (16). On the other hand, the $Q\bar{Q}$ INS interactions lead to mixing between configurations with $q\bar{q}$ and $s\bar{s}$ pairs, as shown in Table V, this kind of mixing between the spin 3/2 configurations is very strong.

Note that it is very difficult to compare our numerical results to the existing experimental data, because the spin parity quantum numbers of the experimentally discovered Ω^* have not been clarified. Here we just tentatively compare the present results to what obtained in different three-quark models, which are listed in Table VI. As we can see, the lowest energies in the present three five-quark models are ~ 200 MeV lower than most of those listed in Table VI, just as we have expected. Accordingly, five-quark components may be the more preferable ones in Ω^* than traditional three-quark excitations, and this can be examined by measurements of $\Omega^*\bar{\Omega}$ production in Ψ' decay performed at BESIII [44].

IV. CONCLUSION

To conclude the present manuscript, here we calculate the energies of 9 low-lying $s^3Q\bar{Q}$ configurations with quantum numbers of Ω^*. One gluon exchange, Goldstone Boson exchange and instanton-induced interactions are taken as hyperfine interactions between

quarks, respectively. In addition, corrections of flavor $SU(3)$ symmetry breaking are also taken into account.

The numerical results show that the OGE and INS hyperfine interactions lead to strong mixing of the configurations with same spin parity, and decrease the energies of the studied states a lot. In OGE model, it's very interesting that the lowest energy state is with spin 3/2 but not 1/2, this is different from results obtained by GBE and INS models. In GBE model, large discrepancies of our results from what obtained in Ref. [9] indicate that the $SU(3)$ breaking corrections are significant. In INS model, $Q\bar{Q}$ hyperfine interactions lead to strong mixing between five-quark configurations with light $q\bar{q}$ and strange $s\bar{s}$, this is the most significant difference between INS and the other two models.

It is not convenient for us to compare our results to experimental data, because the data is very poor. While comparing to predictions of traditional three-quark models, the state with lowest energy in our model is $\sim$ 200 MeV lower, it indicates that the energy cost to excite ground state of Ω hyperon to a five-quark state is less than that to an orbital excitation. Accordingly, five-quark components may be more preferable ones in Ω^*. If this conclusion is correct, namely, the lowest Ω^* is lying at $\sim$ 1800 MeV, then it can be found in measurements of Ψ' decays performed at BESIII. Moreover, if Ω^* with lowest energy is experimentally found at $\sim$ 1800 MeV, spin parity quantum number of this Ω excitation could be an evidence to indicate whether the OGE model or the other two hyperfine interaction models is more appropriate in studies of Ω excitations.

On the other hand, here we have only considered the configurations with negative parity, work on energies of the $s^3Q\bar{Q}$ configurations with positive parity is in progress.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 10905059, 10925526, 11035006 and 11147197), DFG and NSFC (CRC 110), the Chinese Academy of Sciences under Project No.KJCX2-EW-N01 and the Ministry of Science and Technology of China (2009CB825200).

[1] J. Beringer et al. (Particle Data Group), Phys. Rev. D86, 010001 (2012).

[2] V.E. Barnes et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 12, 204 (1964).

[3] S. F. Biagi *et al.*, Z. Phys. C **31**, 33 (1986).

[4] D. Aston *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **194**, 579 (1987).

[5] D. Aston *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **215**, 799 (1988).

[6] K.-T. Chao, N. Isgur, and G. Karl, Phys. Rev. D **23**, 155 (1981).

[7] S. Capstick and N. Isgur, Phys. Rev. D **34**, 2809 (1986).

[8] L. Ya. Glozman and D. O. Riska, Phys. Rep. **268**, 263 (1996).

[9] C. Helminen and D. O. Riska, Nucl. Phys. **A699**, 624 (2002).

[10] U. Löring, B. C. Metsch and H. R. Petry, Eur. Phys. J. A **10**, 447 (2001).

[11] C. E. Carlson and C. D. Carone, Phys. Lett. B **484**, 260 (2000).

[12] C. L. Schat, J. L. Goity, and N. N. Scoccola, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 102002 (2002).

[13] J. L. Goity, C. Schat, and N. N. Scoccola, Phys. Lett. B **564**, 83 (2003).

[14] N. Matagne and Fl. Stancu, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 014010 (2005).

[15] N. Matagne and Fl. Stancu, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 034014 (2006).

[16] Yongseok Oh, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 074002 (2007)

[17] Sourav Sarkar, E. Oset, M.J. Vicente Vacas, Nucl. Phys. **A 750**, 294 (2005).

[18] R. Bijker, E. Santopinto and E. Santopinto, Phys. Rev. C **80**, 065210 (2009)

[19] E. Santopinto and R. Bijker, Phys. Rev. C **82**, 062202 (2010).

[20] Q. B. Li and D. O. Riska, Phys. Rev. C **73**, 035201 (2006)

[21] Q. B. Li and D. O. Riska, Nucl. Phys. A **766**, 172 (2006)

[22] Q. B. Li and D. O. Riska, Phys. Rev. C **74**, 015202 (2006)

[23] B. Julia-Diaz and D. O. Riska, Nucl. Phys. A **780**, 175 (2006)

[24] C. S. An and D. O. Riska, Eur. Phys. J. A **37**, 263 (2008)

[25] C. S. An and B. S. Zou, Eur. Phys. J. A **39**, 195 (2009)

[26] C. S. An, B. Saghai, S. G. Yuan and J. He, Phys. Rev. C **81**, 045203 (2010)

[27] C. S. An and B. Saghai, Phys. Rev. C **84**, 045204 (2011)

[28] C. S. An, D. O. Riska and B. S. Zou, Phys. Rev. C **73**, 035207 (2006) [hep-ph/0511223].

[29] L. Y. .Glozman and D. O. Riska, Nucl. Phys. A **603**, 326 (1996) [Erratum-ibid. A **620**, 510 (1997)]

[30] N. Isgur and G. Karl, Phys. Rev. D **20**, 1191 (1979).

[31] N. Isgur and G. Karl, Phys. Rev. D **19**, 2653 (1979) [Erratum-ibid. D **23**, 817 (1981)].

[32] N. Isgur and G. Karl, Phys. Lett. B **72**, 109 (1977).

[33] S. Capstick and W. Roberts, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **45**, S241 (2000)

[34] U. Löring, B. C. Metsch and H. R. Petry, Eur. Phys. J. A **10**, 395 (2001).

[35] W. H. Blask, U. Bohn, M. G. Huber, B. C. Metsch and H. R. Petry, Z. Phys. A **337**, 327 (1990).

[36] E. Klempt, B. C. Metsch, C. R. Munz and H. R. Petry, Phys. Lett. B **361**, 160 (1995)

[37] M. Koll, R. Ricken, D. Merten, B. C. Metsch and H. R. Petry, Eur. Phys. J. A **9**, 73 (2000) [hep-ph/0008220].

[38] J. Leandri and B. Silvestre-Brac, Phys. Rev. D **40**, 2340 (1989).

[39] B. Silvestre- Brac and J. Leandri, Phys. Rev. D **45**, 4221 (1992).

[40] F. Buccella, H. Hogaasen, J. -M. Richard and P. Sorba, Eur. Phys. J. C **49**, 743 (2007)

[41] H. Hogaasen, J. M. Richard and P. Sorba, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 054013 (2006)

[42] S. G. Yuan, K. W. Wei, J. He, H. S. Xu and B. S. Zou, Eur. Phys. J. A **48**, 61 (2012)

[43] R. Bijker, F. Iachello, and A. Leviatan, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **284**, 89 (2000).

[44] D. M. Asner, T. Barnes, J. M. Bian, I. I. Bigi, N. Brambilla, I. R. Boyko, V. Bytev and K. T. Chao *et al.*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **24**, S1 (2009)

Appendix A: Matrix elements of the operators in OGE model

Matrix elements of the color operators $\vec{\lambda}_1^C \cdot \vec{\lambda}_2^C$ and $-\vec{\lambda}_4^C \cdot \vec{\lambda}_5^{C*}$ between three color states are

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle [211]_{C1} \otimes C_{\bar{Q}} | \vec{\lambda}_1^C \cdot \vec{\lambda}_2^C | [211]_{C1} \otimes C_{\bar{Q}} \rangle &= 4/3\,, \\
\langle [211]_{C2} \otimes C_{\bar{Q}} | \vec{\lambda}_1^C \cdot \vec{\lambda}_2^C | [211]_{C2} \otimes C_{\bar{Q}} \rangle &= -8/3\,, \\
\langle [211]_{C3} \otimes C_{\bar{Q}} | \vec{\lambda}_1^C \cdot \vec{\lambda}_2^C | [211]_{C3} \otimes C_{\bar{Q}} \rangle &= -8/3\,, \\
\langle [211]_{C1} \otimes C_{\bar{Q}} | -\vec{\lambda}_4^C \cdot \vec{\lambda}_5^{C*} | [211]_{C1} \otimes C_{\bar{Q}} \rangle &= 2/3\,, \\
\langle [211]_{C2} \otimes C_{\bar{Q}} | -\vec{\lambda}_4^C \cdot \vec{\lambda}_5^{C*} | [211]_{C2} \otimes C_{\bar{Q}} \rangle &= 2/3\,, \\
\langle [211]_{C3} \otimes C_{\bar{Q}} | -\vec{\lambda}_4^C \cdot \vec{\lambda}_5^{C*} | [211]_{C3} \otimes C_{\bar{Q}} \rangle &= -16/3\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{A1}$$

Matrix elements of the spin operators $\vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{\sigma}_2$ which are independent with the total angular momentum of the five quark configurations are

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle S_5([22]_{S1} \otimes S_{\bar{Q}}) | \vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{\sigma}_2 | S_5([22]_{S1} \otimes S_{\bar{Q}}) \rangle &= 1\,, \\
\langle S_5([22]_{S2} \otimes S_{\bar{Q}}) | \vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{\sigma}_2 | S_5([22]_{S2} \otimes S_{\bar{Q}}) \rangle &= -3\,, \\
\langle S_5([31]_{S1} \otimes S_{\bar{Q}}) | \vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{\sigma}_2 | S_5([31]_{S1} \otimes S_{\bar{Q}}) \rangle &= 1\,, \\
\langle S_5([31]_{S2} \otimes S_{\bar{Q}}) | \vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{\sigma}_2 | S_5([31]_{S2} \otimes S_{\bar{Q}}) \rangle &= 1\,, \\
\langle S_5([31]_{S3} \otimes S_{\bar{Q}}) | \vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{\sigma}_2 | S_5([31]_{S3} \otimes S_{\bar{Q}}) \rangle &= -3\,, \\
\langle S_5([4]_{S} \otimes S_{\bar{Q}}) | \vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{\sigma}_2 | S_5([4]_{S} \otimes S_{\bar{Q}}) \rangle &= 1\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{A2}$$

and those of $\vec{\sigma}_4 \cdot \vec{\sigma}_5$ are

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle 1/2([31]_{S1} \otimes S_{\bar{Q}}) | \vec{\sigma}_4 \cdot \vec{\sigma}_5 | 1/2([31]_{S1} \otimes S_{\bar{Q}}) \rangle &= 1\,, \\
\langle 1/2([31]_{S2} \otimes S_{\bar{Q}}) | \vec{\sigma}_4 \cdot \vec{\sigma}_5 | 1/2([31]_{S2} \otimes S_{\bar{Q}}) \rangle &= -2\,, \\
\langle 1/2([31]_{S3} \otimes S_{\bar{Q}}) | \vec{\sigma}_4 \cdot \vec{\sigma}_5 | 1/2([31]_{S3} \otimes S_{\bar{Q}}) \rangle &= -2\,, \\
\langle 1/2([22]_{S1} \otimes S_{\bar{Q}}) | \vec{\sigma}_4 \cdot \vec{\sigma}_5 | 1/2([31]_{S2} \otimes S_{\bar{Q}}) \rangle &= \sqrt{3}\,, \\
\langle 1/2([22]_{S2} \otimes S_{\bar{Q}}) | \vec{\sigma}_4 \cdot \vec{\sigma}_5 | 1/2([31]_{S3} \otimes S_{\bar{Q}}) \rangle &= \sqrt{3}\,, \\
\langle 3/2([31]_{S1} \otimes S_{\bar{Q}}) | \vec{\sigma}_4 \cdot \vec{\sigma}_5 | 3/2([31]_{S1} \otimes S_{\bar{Q}}) \rangle &= -1/2\,, \\
\langle 3/2([31]_{S2} \otimes S_{\bar{Q}}) | \vec{\sigma}_4 \cdot \vec{\sigma}_5 | 3/2([31]_{S2} \otimes S_{\bar{Q}}) \rangle &= 1\,, \\
\langle 3/2([31]_{S3} \otimes S_{\bar{Q}}) | \vec{\sigma}_4 \cdot \vec{\sigma}_5 | 3/2([31]_{S3} \otimes S_{\bar{Q}}) \rangle &= 1\,,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\langle 3/2([4]_S\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|\vec{\sigma}_4\cdot\vec{\sigma}_5|3/2([4]_S\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle=-3/2\,,$$
$$\langle 3/2([31]_{S1}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|\vec{\sigma}_4\cdot\vec{\sigma}_5|3/2([4]_S\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle=\sqrt{15}/2\,,$$
$$\langle 5/2([4]_S\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|\vec{\sigma}_4\cdot\vec{\sigma}_5|5/2([4]_S\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle=1\,. \tag{A3}$$

Finally, matrix elements of the flavor dependent chromomagnetic strenth operators $C_{1,2}$ and $C_{4,5}$ are as follow

$$\langle s^3q([31]_{F1})\otimes\bar{q}|C_{1,2}|s^3q([31]_{F1})\otimes\bar{q}\rangle=\tfrac{1}{6}(5C_{ss}+C_{qs})\,,$$
$$\langle s^3q([31]_{F2})\otimes\bar{q}|C_{1,2}|s^3q([31]_{F2})\otimes\bar{q}\rangle=\tfrac{1}{3}(2C_{ss}+C_{qs})\,,$$
$$\langle s^3q([31]_{F3})\otimes\bar{q}|C_{1,2}|s^3q([31]_{F3})\otimes\bar{q}\rangle=C_{qs},$$
$$\langle s^3q([31]_{F1})\otimes\bar{q}|C_{1,2}|s^3q([31]_{F2})\otimes\bar{q}\rangle=\tfrac{1}{3\sqrt{2}}(C_{qs}-C_{ss})\,,$$
$$\langle s^3q([31]_{F2})\otimes\bar{q}|C_{1,2}|s^3q([31]_{F1})\otimes\bar{q}\rangle=\tfrac{1}{3\sqrt{2}}(C_{qs}-C_{ss})\,,$$
$$\langle s^3q([4]_F)\otimes\bar{q}|C_{1,2}|s^3q([4]_F)\otimes\bar{q}\rangle=\tfrac{1}{2}(C_{qs}+C_{ss})\,,$$
$$\langle s^4([4]_F)\otimes\bar{s}|C_{1,2}|s^4([4]_F)\otimes\bar{s}\rangle=C_{ss}\,,$$
$$\langle s^3q([31]_{F1})\otimes\bar{q}|C_{1,2}|s^3q([4]_F)\otimes\bar{q}\rangle=\tfrac{\sqrt{3}}{6}(C_{qs}-C_{ss})\,,$$
$$\langle s^3q([31]_{F2})\otimes\bar{q}|C_{1,2}|s^3q([4]_F)\otimes\bar{q}\rangle=\tfrac{\sqrt{6}}{6}(C_{qs}-C_{ss})\,,$$
$$\langle s^3q([31]_{F1})\otimes\bar{q}|C_{4,5}|s^3q([31]_{F1})\otimes\bar{q}\rangle=\tfrac{1}{4}(3C_{\bar{q}q}+C_{\bar{q}s})\,,$$
$$\langle s^3q([31]_{F2})\otimes\bar{q}|C_{4,5}|s^3q([31]_{F2})\otimes\bar{q}\rangle=C_{\bar{q}s}\,,$$
$$\langle s^3q([31]_{F3})\otimes\bar{q}|C_{4,5}|s^3q([31]_{F3})\otimes\bar{q}\rangle=C_{\bar{q}s},$$
$$\langle s^3q([4]_F)\otimes\bar{q}|C_{4,5}|s^3q([4]_F)\otimes\bar{q}\rangle=\tfrac{1}{4}(C_{\bar{q}q}+3C_{\bar{q}s})\,,$$
$$\langle s^4([4]_F)\otimes\bar{s}|C_{4,5}|s^4([4]_F)\otimes\bar{s}\rangle=C_{\bar{s}s}\,. \tag{A4}$$

Notice that here we have only listed the nonzero matrix elements.

Appendix B: Matrix elements of the flavor dependent operator in GBE model

Matrix elements of the flavor dependent operator $C^M_{1,2}\vec{\lambda}^F_1\cdot\vec{\lambda}^F_2$ are as follow

$$\langle s^3q([31]_{F1})\otimes\bar{q}|C_{1,2}|s^3q([31]_{F1})\otimes\bar{q}\rangle=\tfrac{1}{9}(10C^{s\bar{s}}+2C^K)\,,$$
$$\langle s^3q([31]_{F2})\otimes\bar{q}|C_{1,2}|s^3q([31]_{F2})\otimes\bar{q}\rangle=\tfrac{1}{9}(8C^{s\bar{s}}+4C^K)\,,$$
$$\langle s^3q([31]_{F3})\otimes\bar{q}|C_{1,2}|s^3q([31]_{F3})\otimes\bar{q}\rangle=-\tfrac{8}{3}C^K,$$
$$\langle s^3q([31]_{F1})\otimes\bar{q}|C_{1,2}|s^3q([31]_{F2})\otimes\bar{q}\rangle=\tfrac{2\sqrt{2}}{9}(C^K-C^{s\bar{s}})\,,$$

$$\langle s^3q([31]_{F2})\otimes\bar{q}|C_{1,2}|s^3q([31]_{F1})\otimes\bar{q}\rangle = \tfrac{2\sqrt{2}}{9}(C^K - C^{s\bar{s}})\,,$$
$$\langle s^3q([4]_F)\otimes\bar{q}|C_{1,2}|s^3q([4]_F)\otimes\bar{q}\rangle = \tfrac{2}{3}(C^{s\bar{s}} + C_K)\,,$$
$$\langle s^4([4]_F)\otimes\bar{s}|C_{1,2}|s^4([4]_F)\otimes\bar{s}\rangle = \tfrac{4}{3}C^{s\bar{s}}\,,$$
$$\langle s^3q([31]_{F1})\otimes\bar{q}|C_{1,2}|s^3q([4]_F)\otimes\bar{q}\rangle = \tfrac{2}{3\sqrt{3}}(C^K - C^{s\bar{s}})\,,$$
$$\langle s^3q([31]_{F2})\otimes\bar{q}|C_{1,2}|s^3q([4]_F)\otimes\bar{q}\rangle = \tfrac{4}{3\sqrt{6}}(C^K - C^{s\bar{s}})\,. \tag{B1}$$

Appendix C: Matrix elements of the operators in the INS model

Matrix elements of the color operators $P^{C,6}_{1,2}$, $P^{C,\bar{3}}_{1,2}$, $P^{C,8}_{4,5}$ and $P^{C,1}_{4,5}$ between three color states are

$$\langle [211]_{C1}\otimes C_{\bar{Q}}|P^{C,6}_{1,2}|[211]_{C1}\otimes C_{\bar{Q}}\rangle = 1\,,$$
$$\langle [211]_{C2}\otimes C_{\bar{Q}}|P^{C,6}_{1,2}|[211]_{C2}\otimes C_{\bar{Q}}\rangle = 0\,,$$
$$\langle [211]_{C3}\otimes C_{\bar{Q}}|P^{C,6}_{1,2}|[211]_{C3}\otimes C_{\bar{Q}}\rangle = 0\,,$$
$$\langle [211]_{C1}\otimes C_{\bar{Q}}|P^{C,\bar{3}}_{1,2}|[211]_{C1}\otimes C_{\bar{Q}}\rangle = 0\,,$$
$$\langle [211]_{C2}\otimes C_{\bar{Q}}|P^{C,\bar{3}}_{1,2}|[211]_{C2}\otimes C_{\bar{Q}}\rangle = 1\,,$$
$$\langle [211]_{C3}\otimes C_{\bar{Q}}|P^{C,\bar{3}}_{1,2}|[211]_{C3}\otimes C_{\bar{Q}}\rangle = 1\,,$$
$$\langle [211]_{C1}\otimes C_{\bar{Q}}|P^{C,8}_{4,5}|[211]_{C1}\otimes C_{\bar{Q}}\rangle = 1\,,$$
$$\langle [211]_{C2}\otimes C_{\bar{Q}}|P^{C,8}_{4,5}|[211]_{C2}\otimes C_{\bar{Q}}\rangle = 1\,,$$
$$\langle [211]_{C3}\otimes C_{\bar{Q}}|P^{C,8}_{4,5}|[211]_{C3}\otimes C_{\bar{Q}}\rangle = 0\,,$$
$$\langle [211]_{C1}\otimes C_{\bar{Q}}|P^{C,1}_{4,5}|[211]_{C1}\otimes C_{\bar{Q}}\rangle = 1\,,$$
$$\langle [211]_{C2}\otimes C_{\bar{Q}}|P^{C,1}_{4,5}|[211]_{C2}\otimes C_{\bar{Q}}\rangle = 0\,,$$
$$\langle [211]_{C3}\otimes C_{\bar{Q}}|P^{C,1}_{4,5}|[211]_{C3}\otimes C_{\bar{Q}}\rangle = 0\,. \tag{C1}$$

Matrix elements of the spin operators $P^{S=0}_{1,2}$ and $P^{S=1}_{1,2}$ which are independent with the total angular momentum of the five quark configurations are

$$\langle S_5([22]_{S1}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P^{S=0}_{1,2}|S_5([22]_{S1}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 0\,,$$
$$\langle S_5([22]_{S2}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P^{S=0}_{1,2}|S_5([22]_{S2}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 1\,,$$
$$\langle S_5([22]_{S1}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P^{S=1}_{1,2}|S_5([22]_{S1}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 1\,,$$
$$\langle S_5([22]_{S2}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P^{S=1}_{1,2}|S_5([22]_{S2}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 0\,,$$

$$\langle S_5([31]_{S1}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{1,2}^{S=0}|S_5([31]_{S1}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 0\,,$$
$$\langle S_5([31]_{S2}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{1,2}^{S=0}|S_5([31]_{S2}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 0\,,$$
$$\langle S_5([31]_{S3}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{1,2}^{S=0}|S_5([31]_{S3}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 1\,,$$
$$\langle S_5([31]_{S1}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{1,2}^{S=1}|S_5([31]_{S1}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 1\,,$$
$$\langle S_5([31]_{S2}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{1,2}^{S=1}|S_5([31]_{S2}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 1\,,$$
$$\langle S_5([31]_{S3}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{1,2}^{S=1}|S_5([31]_{S3}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 0\,,$$
$$\langle S_5([4]_{S}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{1,2}^{S=0}|S_5([4]_{S}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 0\,,$$
$$\langle S_5([4]_{S}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{1,2}^{S=1}|S_5([4]_{S}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 1\,, \tag{C2}$$

and those of $P_{4,5}^{S=0}$ and $P_{4,5}^{S=1}$ are

$$\langle 1/2([22]_{S1}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{4,5}^{S=0}|1/2([22]_{S1}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 1/4\,,$$
$$\langle 1/2([22]_{S2}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{4,5}^{S=0}|1/2([22]_{S2}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 1/4\,,$$
$$\langle 1/2([22]_{S1}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{4,5}^{S=1}|1/2([22]_{S1}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 3/4\,,$$
$$\langle 1/2([22]_{S2}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{4,5}^{S=1}|1/2([22]_{S2}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 3/4\,,$$
$$\langle 1/2([31]_{S1}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{4,5}^{S=0}|1/2([31]_{S1}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 0\,,$$
$$\langle 1/2([31]_{S2}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{4,5}^{S=0}|1/2([31]_{S2}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 3/4\,,$$
$$\langle 1/2([31]_{S3}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{4,5}^{S=0}|1/2([31]_{S3}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 3/4\,,$$
$$\langle 1/2([31]_{S1}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{4,5}^{S=1}|1/2([31]_{S1}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 1\,,$$
$$\langle 1/2([31]_{S2}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{4,5}^{S=1}|1/2([31]_{S2}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 1/4\,,$$
$$\langle 1/2([31]_{S3}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{4,5}^{S=1}|1/2([31]_{S3}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 1/4\,,$$
$$\langle 1/2([22]_{S1}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{4,5}^{S=0}|1/2([31]_{S2}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = -\sqrt{3}/4\,,$$
$$\langle 1/2([22]_{S2}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{4,5}^{S=0}|1/2([31]_{S3}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = -\sqrt{3}/4\,,$$
$$\langle 1/2([22]_{S1}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{4,5}^{S=1}|1/2([31]_{S2}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = \sqrt{3}/4\,,$$
$$\langle 1/2([22]_{S2}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{4,5}^{S=1}|1/2([31]_{S3}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = \sqrt{3}/4\,,$$
$$\langle 3/2([31]_{S1}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{4,5}^{S=0}|3/2([31]_{S1}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 3/8\,,$$
$$\langle 3/2([31]_{S2}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{4,5}^{S=0}|3/2([31]_{S2}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 0\,,$$
$$\langle 3/2([31]_{S3}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{4,5}^{S=0}|3/2([31]_{S3}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 0\,,$$
$$\langle 3/2([31]_{S1}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{4,5}^{S=1}|3/2([31]_{S1}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 5/8\,,$$
$$\langle 3/2([31]_{S2}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{4,5}^{S=1}|3/2([31]_{S2}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 1\,,$$

$$\langle 3/2([31]_{S3}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{4,5}^{S=1}|3/2([31]_{S3}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 1\,,$$
$$\langle 3/2([4]_{S}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{4,5}^{S=0}|3/2([4]_{S}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 5/8\,,$$
$$\langle 3/2([4]_{S}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{4,5}^{S=1}|3/2([4]_{S}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 3/8\,,$$
$$\langle 3/2([31]_{S1}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{4,5}^{S=0}|3/2([4]_{S}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = -\sqrt{15}/8\,,$$
$$\langle 3/2([31]_{S1}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{4,5}^{S=1}|3/2([4]_{S}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = \sqrt{15}/8\,,$$
$$\langle 5/2([4]_{S}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{4,5}^{S=0}|5/2([4]_{S}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 0\,,$$
$$\langle 5/2([4]_{S}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})|P_{4,5}^{S=1}|5/2([4]_{S}\otimes S_{\bar{Q}})\rangle = 1\,. \tag{C3}$$

TABLE I: The studied $s^3Q\bar{Q}$ configurations with inner quantum number $N_r = L = 0$. Notice that Columns FS and CS just denote the same configurations expressed in two different languages.

FS	CS	J^P
$s^3q([4]_X[211]_C[31]_{FS}[31]_F[22]_S)\otimes\bar{q}$	$s^3q([4]_X[31]_F[211]_{CS}[211]_C[22]_S)\otimes\bar{q}$	$\frac{1}{2}^-$
$s^3q([4]_X[211]_C[31]_{FS}[31]_F[31]_S)\otimes\bar{q}$	$s^3q([4]_X[31]_F[211]_{CS}[211]_C[31]_S)\otimes\bar{q}$	$\frac{1}{2}^-$ $\frac{3}{2}^-$
$s^3q([4]_X[211]_C[31]_{FS}[31]_F[4]_S)\otimes\bar{q}$	$s^3q([4]_X[31]_F[211]_{CS}[211]_C[4]_S)\otimes\bar{q}$	$\frac{3}{2}^-$ $\frac{5}{2}^-$
$s^3q([4]_X[211]_C[31]_{FS}[4]_F[31]_S)\otimes\bar{q}$	$s^3q([4]_X[4]_F[211]_{CS}[211]_C[31]_S)\otimes\bar{q}$	$\frac{1}{2}^-$ $\frac{3}{2}^-$
$s^4([4]_X[211]_C[31]_{FS}[4]_F[31]_S)\otimes\bar{s}$	$s^4([4]_X[4]_F[211]_{CS}[211]_C[31]_S)\otimes\bar{s}$	$\frac{1}{2}^-$ $\frac{3}{2}^-$

TABLE II: Values for the parameters in three kinds of hyperfine interactions (in unit of MeV).

OGE	m	340	m_s	460	ω	196	V_0	-208
	C_{qq}	18.3	C_{qs}	11.2	C_{ss}	6.8	$C_{q\bar{q}}$	29.8
	$C_{q\bar{s}}$	18.4	$C_{s\bar{s}}$	8.6				
GBE	m	340	m_s	460	ω	196	V_0	-269
	C^{π}	21						
INS	m	340	m_s	460	ω	196	V_0	-213
	g	52.5	g'	33.3				

TABLE III: Energies of the studied five-quark configurations in the three models, compared to the results obtained in [9] listed in column HR. The results are in unit of MeV.

J^P	OGE	GBE	INS	HR
$\frac{1}{2}^-$	2146	1834	1797	1917
	2451	1894	2027	1973
	2677	2012	2223	2141
	2655	2162	2431	2381
$\frac{3}{2}^-$	1818	1894	1987	1973
	2331	1990	2025	2085
	2503	2012	2143	2141
	2517	2162	2717	2381
$\frac{5}{2}^-$	2492	1990	1987	2085

TABLE IV: Coefficients for the mixings of the configurations with spin 1/2 in three models.

HYP	1	2	3	4
OGE	0.843	0.538	0.009	0
	-0.535	0.836	0.122	0
	0.058	-0.108	0.992	0
	0	0	0	1
GBE	1	0	0	0
	0	0.990	0.138	0
	0	-0.138	0.990	0
	0	0	0	1
INS	0.678	0.735	-0.004	-0.003
	0.720	-0.662	0.184	0.098
	-0.109	0.105	0.949	0.276
	-0.103	0.010	0.256	0.956

TABLE V: Coefficients for the mixings of the configurations with spin 3/2 in three models.

HYP	1	2	3	4
OGE	-0.627	0.771	0.110	0
	0.243	0.060	0.968	0
	0.740	0.634	-0.226	0
	0	0	0	1
GBE	0.990	0	0.138	0
	0	1	0	0
	-0.138	0	0.990	0
	0	0	0	1
INS	0.646	0.612	-0.456	0.000
	0.647	-0.138	0.730	-0.170
	0.352	-0.560	-0.254	0.706
	-0.201	0.541	0.440	0.688

TABLE VI: Ω^* with spin parity $1/2^-$ and $3/2^-$ predicted in the non-relativistic quark model (OGE), relativized quark model (ROGE), Glozman-Riska model (GBE), covariant quark model based on Bethe-Salpeter equation with instanton-induced quark force (BSE), large N_c analysis, algebraic model (BIL), and Skyrme model. The mass is given in the unit of MeV.

State	OGE [6]	ROGE [7]	GBE [8]	BSE[10]	Large-N_c [11–15]	BIL [43]	Skyrme Model[16]
$\Omega(\frac{1}{2}^-)$	2020	1950	1991	1992	2061	1989	1837
		2410		2456			
$\Omega(\frac{3}{2}^-)$	2020	2000	1991	1976	2100	1989	1978
		2440		2446			2604